



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,117	09/26/2003	Thomas Joseph Fyvie	RD29557-5	2429

6147 7590 01/03/2008
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

STINSON, FRANKIE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1792

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

01/03/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ldocket@crd.ge.com
rosssr@crd.ge.com
parkskl@crd.ge.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,117

Applicant(s)

FYVIE ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 18-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 18-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1792

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 18-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robbins (U. S. Pat. No. 3,089,325) in view of FRANCE'149 (FRANCE 2 594 149) or Japan'394 (Japan 2001-198394) or France et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,840,069).

Re claim 1, 10 and 18, Robbins is cited disclosing an article cleaning apparatus comprising:

an air management mechanism (col. 1, lines 56-62);

a cleaning basket assembly (101);

a fluid regeneration device (60, 61) said fluid regeneration device including a cleaning solvent absorption media that contains a portion of solvent based cleaning fluid to replace the solvent consumed (col. 6, lines 34-40);

a working fluid device (50) coupled to said fluid regeneration device, said basket and said air management mechanism;

a clean fluid device (10) coupled to said cleaning basket assembly and said fluid regeneration device;

a controller (typical) coupled to said air management mechanism, said cleaning basket assembly, said working fluid device, said regeneration device, and said clean fluid device; wherein said controller is configured to control a cleaning process,

including at least a solvent cleaning process, wherein said solvent cleaning process utilizes a solvent based cleaning fluid that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the solvent comprising cyclic siloxane solvent and a solvent contamination detection device to determine the amount of accumulated contaminant and the detector detecting electromagnetic radiation.. The patents to France, Japan'394 and FRANCE'149 are each cited disclosing a solvent cleaning process, wherein said solvent cleaning process utilizes a solvent contamination detection device to determine the amount of accumulated contaminant in the solvent. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Robbins, to include a contamination detection means as taught by France Japan'98394 or FRANCE'149, for the purpose of ensuring articles are never cleaned in a dirty or contaminated solvent, thereby preventing the contamination of the articles from the dirty solvent. As for the specific solvent being cyclic siloxane solvent and detector or electromagnetic radiation, France discloses the use of various sensors (col. 13, lines 9-21). To employ one over another is deemed to be an obvious matter of design. The same is of little patentable weight in that the use of one solvent over another is deemed to be a mere substitution of equivalents.(see MPEP 2144.06 SUBSTITUTING EQUIVALENTS KNOWN FOR THE SAME PURPOSE). Nonetheless, France discloses the solvent (col. 3, lines 14-16, as condensed fluid) as claimed (col. 5, lines 48-60). Re claims 2-6 and 11-14, France discloses the detection device (col. 9, lines 43-60) as claimed. Re claim 7-9 and 15-17, Japan'98394 and FRANCE'149 discloses the controller as claimed. All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the

Art Unit: 1792


elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls


FRANKIE L. STINSON
Primary Examiner
GROUP ART UNIT 1792